

Date: Thu, 16 Jun 94 09:32:00 PDT  
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V94 #671  
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest                      Thu, 16 Jun 94                      Volume 94 : Issue    671

Today's Topics:

        "Renewal" reusable alkaline batteries  
        AEA IsoLoop - Opinions/Experiences  
        Direction Finding Video  
        FCC Fees (historical) - Update  
        Help:emergency USCG freq?  
IMMEDIATE LICENSING? Bad implementation. Good idea. (2 msgs)  
        operating from Greece  
        You know its time to retire from the hobby when.... (3 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----

Date: 16 Jun 1994 11:01:02 -0400  
From: newstf01.cr1.aol.com!search01.news.aol.com!not-for-mail@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: "Renewal" reusable alkaline batteries  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <1994Jun15.221000.3518@eisner>, cornelius@eisner.decus.org  
(George Cornelius) writes:

>Does anyone have experience with them

I've changed over all my portable gear (2m HT, scanner, CD player,  
portable SW, PDA) from nicads to Renewals (AA and AAA). I've been  
getting very good life out of the cells. What I like best about them  
is that they don't have nicad-like memories to worry about. If I'm  
unsure about how much charge is left in a set before heading out, I

simply pop in a fully charged set (they don't drain unused, like nicads), put the questionable ones in the charger, and exit.

In fact, Ray0Vac suggests that charging them before they run too far down will help get more life out of them. Recharge times for low batteries can get pretty long (six hours or more occasionally), but that hasn't been a problem for me so far.

The cells are physically different, with almost no lip on the tubular case near the positive terminal. This difference in design makes sure that only Renewals will fit in their chargers. And, you must charge the cells with the Renewal charger--don't use the nicad chargers that come with your gizmos to recharge inside the gear.

In any case, I'm very pleased with the system, especially being free of nicad auto discharging and memory worries.

Danny Goodman AE9F/6

-----  
Date: Thu, 16 Jun 1994 15:43:59 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!ulowell!  
wang!dbushong@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: AEA IsoLoop - Opinions/Experiences  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

cjackso@uswnvg.com (Clay Jackson) writes:

>Ronald H. Bafetti (baffer@pnet01.cts.COM) wrote:  
>: Anyone out there using (or familiar with someone who uses) the AEA IsoLoop  
>: antenna? It's kind of caught my fancy as a reasonable alternative to a  
>: full-sized beam. Is it the urban dweller's answer to casual QSOs in the  
>: 10-30MHz world?

>I've got one in my attic, and it works great as far as I can tell. I've only  
>worked 10M, and if I can hear 'em I can work 'em.

I agree - mine is on a ground-mounted tripod on a 10' pole, kind of hidden in a tall bush. Last night I busted a pileup on 14.015 and got him on my first call. That's sort of unusual, but it gives you an idea of how well it can perform.

>Tuning it can be a bit of a pain - but once you get used to it, it's not bad  
>at all.

I agree with that, too. It's an acceptable pain, considering that otherwise I'd be off the air.

73,  
Dave, KZ10

--

Dave Bushong, Wang Laboratories, Inc.

-----

Date: 16 Jun 1994 14:23:37 GMT  
From: juniper.almaden.ibm.com!ibmboulder!ibmboulder!usenet@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: Direction Finding Video  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Our club is going to have a meeting on DF'ing next month (July). We plan to have several different types of DF'ing equipment there (mostly home brew).

I was wondering if anyone has or knows where I can get any video on DFing.

Please let me know if you have a source.

73 and Thanks Bob KA5GLX Houston, Tx biekert@vnet.ibm.com

-----

Date: Thu, 16 Jun 1994 13:03:24 GMT  
From: newsgate.melpar.esys.com!melpar!phb@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: FCC Fees (historical) - Update  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

This is a follow-up to a comment I posted yesterday relative to FCC fees. Sorry, but nn isn't being updated here at work so if you've flamed me I haven't seen it yet.

My previous post was "off the top of my head" regarding what kinds of things were subject to FCC fees, so I went home last night and checked through some old records to clarify the issue of what the FCC used to charge for license applications. The excerpt below is from "The Radio Amateur's License Manual," 69th edition, 1973, pp. 5-6:

#### "Application Fees"

"The Federal Communications Commission fee for new or renewed amateur licenses is \$9; for modification, such as change of address, \$4; for duplicate license, \$6; and for special call signs as provided for in Section 97.51, \$25. A check or money order payable to the Federal Communications Commission must accompany

each application. Note that this is a filing (emphasized) fee; FCC keeps the money whether or not a license is issued as a result!"

"All applications involving new or existing licenses of the Novice class, of military recreation stations (defined in Section 97.3), of RACES stations or involving reciprocal operating permits, are exempt from fees. Procedures for payment of fees are spelled out in an appendix to the FCC rules, Chapter 10 of this booklet."

Final comments: Appendix 6 to the FCC rules, which covers fees, is contained in the same edition of the "License Manual" on p. 113. I checked my 1956 (36th edition) "License Manual" and there is no mention of any fees in effect at that time. I really don't know the dates when fees went into effect or were later done away with.

73,

Paul, K4MSG

(|\_|) \* Paul H. Bock, Jr. K4MSG \* Internet: pbock@melpar.esys.com  
| |) \* Senior Systems Engineer \* Telephone: (703) 560-5000 x2062

"You can have my bug when you can pry my cold, dead fingers from around it....." - anonymous radiotelegraph operator

-----  
Date: 16 Jun 1994 15:22:45 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!howland.reston.ans.net!math.ohio-state.edu!  
magnus.acs.ohio-state.edu!aalettras@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Help:emergency USCG freq?  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I would like to know the frequency that is monitored by the US CoastGuard in the range of 150-170 MHz for emergencies.  
Which channel # is it? What is the frequency?

Please reply directly to my e-mail address.

Thanks in advance,

anthony aletras  
N8/SV2ABQ  
aletras.2@osu.edu

-----  
Date: 16 Jun 1994 12:48:53 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!news.umbc.edu!  
haven.umd.edu!cville-srv.wam.umd.edu!ham@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: IMMEDIATE LICENSING? Bad implementation. Good idea.  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <wa2iseCrH7vv.12A@netcom.com>,  
Robert Casey <wa2ise@netcom.com> wrote:  
>In article <2tmvvu\$1ql@cville-srv.wam.umd.edu> ham@wam.umd.edu (Scott Richard  
Rosenfeld) writes:  
>>Immediate licensing was an EXCELLENT idea. I believe that nearly EVERY  
>>ham on the air would have agreed with this. The VE's giving the exam  
>>should have been allowed to call the FCC computer, use a modem, and  
>>enter the data directly into the FCC database, at which point a call-  
>>sign would have been spit out. Ideally, THIS is the way it should be.  
>>  
>How about the FCC giving the VEC's a list of new callsigns to be given  
>to successful examinees on the spot, and the VEC's just fill out a form  
>with the new call holder's name and address? Maybe some VEC's might let  
>people pick and choose a little from the list. "Can I have that one, 'ISE'?"  
>Similar security as that with the present paperwork. Only thing is that  
>no callsign should get "lost" (ie, never issued because someone VEC lost  
>that particular form with it printed on.). Shouldn't be any major problem.

Only problem (and I have found this with my own posting) is that the  
"Pay-for-license" scam would be that much harder to nip in the bud.

Imagine if one of the corrupt VE crews had a bunch of licenses to  
give out to people passing their exams, and some people came along  
with a big wad of money and instead of just helping them all PASS,  
which HAS happened, \

they were actually issued licenses, too...

Oy, the mess we could have... At the very most, the VEC should do  
the filing electronically. We'd be reasonably certain to avoid il-  
legally given licenses, and the time would still be fairly short.

Scott NF3I

--

73,

----- The  
      \ / Long Original  
Scott Rosenfeld Amateur Radio NF3I Burtonsville, MD | Live \$5.00  
WAC-CW/SSB WAS DXCC - 125 QSLed on dipoles -----| Dipoles! Antenna!

-----  
Date: Thu, 16 Jun 1994 14:29:39 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!howland.reston.ans.net!news.cac.psu.edu!  
news.pop.psu.edu!ra!usenet@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: IMMEDIATE LICENSING? Bad implementation. Good idea.  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <wa2iseCrH7vv.12A@netcom.com> wa2ise@netcom.com (Robert Casey) writes:

>  
> [some stuff deleted here]  
>  
> How about the FCC giving the VEC's a list of new callsigns to be given  
> to successful examinees on the spot, and the VEC's just fill out a form  
> with the new call holder's name and address? Maybe some VEC's might let  
> people pick and choose a little from the list. "Can I have that one,  
> 'ISE'?" Similar security as that with the present paperwork. Only thing  
> is that no callsign should get "lost" (ie, never issued because someone  
> VEC lost that particular form with it printed on.). Shouldn't be any  
> major problem.

Others have made similar suggestions.

I don't support instant callsign assignment by supplying VE's with a list of callsigns. It complicates the assignment and management of callsigns by the FCC, something that is probably enough of a headache for the agency as it stands.

I could agree to instant electronic filing of applications by VE's. I agree that this would (could) speed up the licensing cycle by an order of magnitude. It would certainly unload much, if not all of the data entry currently handled by the handful of clerks in Gettysburg. Given that a mailing is done once a week, you could get a license well within two weeks - a very reasonable waiting period.

However, what are the security issues associated with electronic filing? Would it be any less subject to abuse than the current system?

-Dave

--

David Drumheller, KA3QBG                      phone: (202) 767-3524  
Acoustics Division, Code 7140                fax: (202) 404-7732  
Naval Research Laboratory  
Washington, DC 20375-5350    e-mail: drumhell@claudette.nrl.navy.mil

-----

Date: 16 Jun 1994 15:15:16 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!howland.reston.ans.net!math.ohio-state.edu!  
magnus.acs.ohio-state.edu!aalettras@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: operating from Greece  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

To operate from Greece according to the reciprocal agreement between the US and Greece you need to present your licence to the Ministry of Transportation and Telecommunication in Athens, Greece. To my knowledge this was required some years ago in order to obtain the local licence. You can also write to ARRL and find out more about it. Usually they have current info available about reciprocal agreement requirements.

anthony aletras  
N8/SV2ABQ  
aletras.2@osu.edu

-----  
Date: 16 Jun 1994 12:46:50 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!gatech!news-feed-1.peachnet.edu!news.duke.edu!  
solaris.cc.vt.edu!usenet@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: You know its time to retire from the hobby when....  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <2tn7jq\$bsf@tekadm1.cse.tek.com> gau.landm@tekig7.pen.tek.com  
(Mike Gauland) writes:  
> You answer your phone, "QRZ?"  
>

And, after you find out who the calling party is, you say  
"your 59 in Virginia..."

--  
Benjy Cline, AC4X0  
Virginia Tech Computing Center  
benjy@benjy.cc.vt.edu

-----  
Date: Thu, 16 Jun 1994 13:53:26 GMT  
From: noc.near.net!das-news.harvard.edu!cantaloupe.srv.cs.cmu.edu!dolphin!  
ed@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: You know its time to retire from the hobby when....  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

You are in your car, and see somebody you know walking down the street...

instead of going beep-beep and waving...

you pound out CQ on your car horn and wave.

-----

Date: Thu, 16 Jun 1994 15:45:58 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!gatech!newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!zip.eecs.umich.edu!  
yeshua.marcam.com!news.kei.com!wang!dbushong@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: You know its time to retire from the hobby when....  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

jcw@kd4dts.atl.ga.us (John C. Wren) writes:

>you've named your brand new German Shepherd puppy 'Radio Flyer' to combine  
>two of your hobbies... (this is true, this is my dog's name...)

Oh, no.... I forgot about our cat, named "CQ", who would think it was  
dinnertime whenever I operated 20m SSB.

Dave, KZ10

--

Dave Bushong, Wang Laboratories, Inc.

-----

Date: Thu, 16 Jun 1994 12:52:01 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!csulb.edu!csus.edu!netcom.com!  
rogjd@network.ucsd.edu  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <2tketk\$3os@nyx10.cs.du.edu>, <rogjdCrFwnu.Bt2@netcom.com>,  
<CrGEuI.LKu@news.Hawaii.Edu>  
Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

Jeffrey Herman (jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu) wrote:

: Roger, every day on the news and in the newspapers I hear/read of many  
: frivolous lawsuits being filed for what seems to me very silly reasons.  
: Yet no matter how ridiculous the claim the defendant must spend his/her  
: own hard earned money defending him/herself. I think we all see how  
: high emotions are running in this debate and Jay is correct in that  
: some hams will certainly file a lawsuit if they can't get their way.  
: It's a shame when volunteers, believing they are doing their job properly,  
: have to fear lawsuits in carrying out their duties.

Jeff, you are entitled to your opinion. But Jay is completely off-base  
when he takes the approach: "doesn't matter if I'm right or wrong,



because either way, if things are done other than my way, you will be entangled in a tidal wave of frivolous lawsuits."

That's simply rubbish. There is no evidence of this other than, I guess, one or two examples of someone threatening a lawsuit out in Texas.

Go over to Misc.Legal (where I am also active :-)) if you want to get into a big discussion about frivolous lawsuits. Let's leave it out of this thread. That's all I'm saying.

Jay's argument lacks validity.

--

rogjd@netcom.com  
Glendale, CA  
AB6WR

-----  
Date: 16 Jun 1994 14:46:29 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!  
news.umbc.edu!haven.umd.edu!umd5.umd.edu!mark@network.ucsd.edu  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <2tmvuu\$1ql@cville-srv.wam.umd.edu>, <wa2iseCrH7vv.12A@netcom.com>,  
<2tphnl\$ckh@cville-srv.wam.umd.edu>  
Subject : Re: IMMEDIATE LICENSING? Bad implementation. Good idea.

In article <2tphnl\$ckh@cville-srv.wam.umd.edu>,  
Scott Richard Rosenfeld <ham@wam.umd.edu> wrote:  
>>How about the FCC giving the VEC's a list of new callsigns to be given  
>>to successful examinees on the spot, and the VEC's just fill out a form  
>>with the new call holder's name and address?  
>  
>Only problem (and I have found this with my own posting) is that the  
>"Pay-for-license" scam would be that much harder to nip in the bud.  
>  
>Imagine if one of the corrupt VE crews had a bunch of licenses to  
>give out to people passing their exams, and some people came along  
>with a big wad of money and instead of just helping them all PASS,  
>which HAS happened, \

I don't understand how corrupt VEs are more of a problem under the proposed scheme than under the current one.

Current:

1. bad guy pays off VE

2. VE sends paper to FCC
3. bad guy gets license

Proposed:

1. bad guy pays off VE
2. bad guy gets license
3. VE sends paper to FCC

>Oy, the mess we could have... At the very most, the VEC should do  
>the filing electronically. We'd be reasonably certain to avoid il-  
>legally given licenses, and the time would still be fairly short.

But doesn't that turn in to:

1. bad guy pays off VE
2. VE sends computer data instead of paper to FCC
3. bad guy gets license

So what am I missing?

-----  
Date: Wed, 15 Jun 1994 15:56:11 GMT  
From: psinntp!arrl.org!zlau@uunet.uu.net  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <2ti78m\$q4l@abyss.West.Sun.COM>, <2tj6rp\$7mi@ccnet.ccnet.com>,  
<2tjr8j\$kbt@proffa.cc.tut.fi>  
Subject : Re: Microwave bands (was Re: End of '440 in SoCal' thread )

Kein{nen Paul OH3LWR (k23690@proffa.cc.tut.fi) wrote:

: If you want similar omnidirectional (horisontal) coverage as with  
: repeaters in lower bands, you need much more ERP. The radation pattern  
: at the repeater site can be flattened to a few degrees, the mobile radiation  
: pattern to maybe 10-30 degrees and the portable to 40-90 degrees to get some  
: antenna gain. Beyond this, you have to use adaptive phased arrays and  
: have to forget about round table operation.

In some areas, it may be possible to point the antennas at a common  
reflector. Interestingly, one place where this supposedly works  
is Southern California, where you have most of the population living  
on one side of a mountain range.

This does make it difficult to use circular polarization, since the  
reflection will change the sense. However, of the 6 stations I worked  
on 5760 in the last June VHF contest, I'm pretty sure everyone was  
running horizontally polarized horns or dishes.

--

Zack Lau KH6CP/1 2 way QRP WAS  
8 States on 10 GHz  
Internet: zlau@arrl.org 10 grids on 2304 MHz

Date: 16 Jun 1994 14:51:44 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!  
news.umbc.edu!haven.umd.edu!cville-srv.wam.umd.edu!ham@network.ucsd.edu  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <2tn7jq\$bsf@tekadm1.cse.tek.com>, <2tphjq\$e69@solaris.cc.vt.edu>,  
<CrHt93.AuK@fore.com>n  
Subject : Re: You know its time to retire from the hobby when....

This has really happened to me:

You're sitting outside somewhere, and you notice you've been hearing "0 0 0 0 0 0," just a constant string of the letter "0," and for quite some time. Not consciously - it just popped into your head - and you start to listen to the surroundings...

And there's a bird singing "000H 000H 000H," over and over and over...

```
--
73,                                     ----- The
                                     \ /  Long   Original
Scott Rosenfeld  Amateur Radio NF3I  Burtonsville, MD      |   Live   $5.00
    WAC-CW/SSB   WAS   DXCC - 125 QSLed on dipoles -----|   Dipoles! Antenna!
```

Date: Thu, 16 Jun 1994 11:40:56 GMT  
From: world!drt@uunet.uu.net  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <2tknm9\$m2e@chnews.intel.com>,  
<2tlf2n\$pjr@search01.news.aol.com>,<CrG1G9.170@wang.com>,  
<1994Jun15.133855.1345@pacs.sunbelt.net>  
Subject : Re: "73's"

```
ddepew@CHM.TEC.SC.US wrote:
: In article <CrG1G9.170@wang.com>, dbushong@wang.com (Dave Bushong) writes:
: >teacherjh@aol.com (Teacherjh) writes:
: >
: >>Language is dynamic, not static. 73's (the plural of 73, by many
: >>official accounts) means "Best Wishes". It didn't used to, but it
```

: >>does now.  
: >  
: >>Therefore, 73 means "best wish".

That doesn't follow at all, of course.

So, if you say 73, you are only  
: >>wishing the listener one wish. OK, it's your best one, but it's  
: >>still only one. If you want to be more ebulliant, use 73's. (Or you  
: >>can try 146, 219, or any of the other multiples of 73 to give a fixed  
: >>number of wishes.)  
: >  
: >Didn't you see Aladdin? You can't wish for more wishes.  
: >  
: >Sheesh.  
: >  
: >3333333,  
: >Dave  
: >--  
: >Dave Bushong, Wang Laboratories, Inc.

: 73 means "best regards." So, 73's must mean "best regardses."

And that doesn't follow, either.

Get used to it: 73 and 73s both mean "best regards." There's  
grammatical logic behind both. Why does this bug people? Is it  
really so important? Who cares anymore? Sheesh.

-drt

-----  
David R. Tucker      KG2S                      8P9CL                      drt@world.std.com

-----  
Date: 16 Jun 1994 15:54:13 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!  
news.umbc.edu!haven.umd.edu!cville-srv.wam.umd.edu!ham@network.ucsd.edu  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <wa2iseCrH7vv.12A@netcom.com>, <2tphn1\$ckh@cville-srv.wam.umd.edu>,  
<2tpok5\$4nf@umd5.umd.edu>md.edu  
Subject : Re: IMMEDIATE LICENSING? Bad implementation. Good idea.

In article <2tpok5\$4nf@umd5.umd.edu>,  
>I don't understand how corrupt VEs are more of a problem under

>the proposed scheme than under the current one.

>

>Current:

- > 1. bad guy pays off VE
- > 2. VE sends paper to FCC
- > 3. bad guy gets license

>

>Proposed:

- > 1. bad guy pays off VE
- > 2. bad guy gets license
- > 3. VE sends paper to FCC

>

>But that turns into:

>

- > 1. bad guy pays off VE
- > 2. VE sends computer data instead of paper to FCC
- > 3. bad guy gets license

>

>So what am I missing?

>

What happens now is that many scams go through the VEC office and are caught BEFORE licenses are issued. All that's necessary is that the EXAMS are nullified - generally, nobody has to go through the trouble of revoking licenses, either temporarily or permanently. If the license were given prior to the VEC checking of the forms, EVERY scam would result in granting, and possible revocation of that license.

Who wants to deal with that? Just let the VEC do the filing for the licenses, they still do their "double-checking & filtering" job, and the turnaround time for licenses is STILL greatly reduced.

Scott NF3I

--

73,

----- The  
      \ / Long Original  
Scott Rosenfeld Amateur Radio NF3I Burtonsville, MD | Live \$5.00  
WAC-CW/SSB WAS DXCC - 125 QSLed on dipoles -----| Dipoles! Antenna!

-----

End of Info-Hams Digest V94 #671

\*\*\*\*\*